REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-22, and 24-31 were pending in the application when last examined, all of which stand rejected. In the present response, Claims 1, 9, 19, and 27 are amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2005/0110924 to Kim et al. ("Kim").

Applicant traverses this rejection on the basis that Kim is not a proper prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). For Kim to be a prior art reference under the cited section, it has to have been filed in the U.S. before invention by the applicant for patent. The subject application was invented on or before October 13, 2003, which is the effective priority date of the Korean filing. As Kim was filed in the U.S. on October 1, 2004, which is almost a whole year after October 13, 2003, Kim does not qualify as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). A translation of the Korean application and a statement attesting to the accuracy of the translation will be filed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 8, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0133066 to Ono et al. ("Ono") in view of JP Published Patent Application No. 10-098190 to Kubota ("Kubota").

Claim 1 is patentable over Ono and Kubota because it recites that "the shielding electrode has substantially the same shape as the region between the source electrode and

the drain electrode in plan view." FIG. 4 of the Application, for example, shows that the shielding electrodes 196a are not only positioned between the input electrodes 173a (source electrodes) and the output electrodes 175a (drain electrodes) but are shaped substantially the same as the region between the electrodes 173a and 175a. More specifically, in the embodiment depicted in FIG. 4, the shape of the shielding electrodes 196a resembles multiple horseshoes connected to one another to match the shape of the region between the electrodes 173a and 175a. By providing shielding electrodes that substantially match the shape of the region between source and drain electrodes, any undesirable effect of common voltage Vcom applied to the common electrode 270 on the channels of the TFTs is reduced, preventing any drifting of the threshold voltage of the TFTs [see paragraph 118 starting at the bottom of page 14 of PCT/KR2004/002611]. In addition, by applying a predetermined voltage such as the gate-off voltage Voff lower than the common voltage Vcom to the shielding electrodes, the driving voltage of the TFTs can be reduced and the switching time of the TFTs can be advanced to increase the operational efficiency of the TFTs [see paragraph 118 of PCT/KR2004/002611].

In contrast, Ono's shielding electrode CLT has an entirely different shape than the region between its source electrode SPM and its drain electrode DL. Ono's FIG. 1, for example, shows that the shielding electrode CLT extends along the shape of the source electrode SPM and also extends along the drain electrode DL, but only fills part of the region between the source electrode SPM and the drain electrode DL. There is no resemblance between the shape of the region between the source electrode SPM and the drain electrode DL and the shape of the shielding electrode CLT in plan view.

Hence, Claim 1 and Claims 2-6, 8, and 26 that depend from Claim 1 are patentable over Ono and Kubota.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono and Kubota as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0066481 to Hong et al. ("Hong"). This rejection is based on the assumption that Ono and Kubota disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. However, for the reasons provided above, this assumption is incorrect. Claim 1 is patentable over Ono and Kubota, and Hong fails to cure their deficiency. Hence, Claim 7 is patentable over a combination of Ono, Kubota, and Hong.

Claims 9-12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong in view of Ono.

Independent Claim 9 is patentable over Hong and Ono because it recites that "the shielding electrode has substantially the same shape as a region between the source electrode and the drain electrode …." As explained above, neither Hong nor Ono discloses this limitation. Hence, Claim 9 and Claims 10-12 and 18 that depend therefrom are patentable over Hong and Ono.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong and Ono as applied to Claim 9, and further in view of Kubota. This rejection is based on the assumption that Hong and Ono disclose all the limitations of Claim 9. However, as explained above, this assumption is incorrect and Claim 9 is patentable over Hong and Ono.

As Kubota fails to cure this deficiency, Claims 13 and 14 that depend from Claim 9 are patentable over the combination of Hong, Ono, and Kubota.

Claims16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong in view of Ono as applied to Claim 9, and further in view of Kubo. This rejection is based on the assumption that Hong and Ono disclose all the limitations of Claim 9. However, as explained above, this assumption is incorrect and Claim 9 is patentable over Hong and Ono. As Kubo fails to cure this deficiency, Claims 13 and 14 that depend from Claim 9 are patentable over the combination of Hong, Ono, and Kubo.

Claims19-22, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota in view of Ono.

Independent Claim 19, however, is patentable over Kubota and Ono because it recites that "the shielding electrode has substantially the same shape as a region between the source electrode and the drain electrode …," which Kubota and Ono fail to disclose as explained above. Hence, Claim 19 and Claims 20-22, 24, and 25 that depend therefrom are patentable over Kubota and Ono.

Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota in view of Ono. Claim 27, however, recites that "the shielding electrode has substantially the same shape as a region between the source electrode and the drain electrode …," similarly to Claim 19. Hence, independent Claim 27 and Claims 28-31 that depend

therefrom are patentable over Kubota and Ono for the same reason Claim 19 is patentable over them.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Authorization is given to charge any fees due or credit any overpayments in regard to this communication to deposit account 50-5029. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (408) 331-1672 is welcomed and encouraged.

Certification of Electronic Transmission

Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's EFS-Web electronic system on:

August 6, 2010

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Kieun "Jenny" Sung

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/

Respectfully submitted,

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/
Kieun "Jenny" Sung
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,639

Innovation Counsel LLP
21771 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 200
Cupertino, California 95014
Direct: (408) 331-1672
Telephone: (408) 331-1670
Facsimile: (408) 725-8263
E-mail: jsung@innovationcounsel.com